arXiv:1410.5220v2 [hep-ph] 21 Oct 2014

Why mean p_{T} is interesting

Michal Praszalowicz

M. Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University,
S. Lojasiewicz str. 11, 30-348 Krakow, Poland.

Abstract. We discuss energy dependence of mean p_{T} correlation with N_{ch} basing on general features of high energy collisions such as saturation and geometrical scaling. We use Color Glass Condensate calculation of an effective interaction radius that scales as a third root of multiplicity, and then saturates. With this model input we construct scaling variable for $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle(N_{\mathrm{ch}})$ at different energies both for pp and pPb collisions, and show that recent ALICE data indeed does exhibit this scaling property. We discuss energy dependence of the interaction radius and argue that since the radius cannot grow too large, a universal behavior of $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle$ for large multiplicities is expected.

Keywords: Saturation, geometrical scaling, interaction radius
PACS: 13.85.Hd, 12.38.Aw

Correlations are always interesting since they are sensitive to the fine details of interactions. For example standard PYTHIA Monte Carlo fails in the case of $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle$ correlation with N_{ch} (see *e.g.* Refs. [1, 2]), while it does describe well one particle spectra and total multiplicities. New effect called color recombination (see *e.g.* [3]) has to be added to PYTHIA to take care of rather strong rise of $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle$ with N_{ch}. On the other hand newer MC generator EPOS [4] that has saturation effects built in does not require special tuning to describe $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle$ in function of N_{ch} [1, 2]. In this talk that is based on Refs. [5, 6] (and where a complete list of references can be found) we shall study consequences of saturation and geometrical scaling (GS) for mean transverse momenta at the LHC. Here the energy must be really large since the character of $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle$ dependence on N_{ch} changes dramatically (see Fig. 1 in Ref. [7]) from the ISR energies (where it decreases or stays constant) to the LHC energies (where it rises). Theoretical interest in $\langle p_{\mathrm{T}}\rangle$ correlation with N_{ch} goes back to the paper by L. van Hove [8] where he pointed out that qualitative change is expected in the presence of the QCD phase transition. Today this motivation is perhaps less important since the QCD deconfining transition is believed to be a soft crossover.

From the saturation point of view high energy central rapidity production of moderate p_{T} particles can be viewed as a result of a collision of two gluonic clouds characterized by one saturation scale that depends on gluon longitudinal momenta $x_1 \sim x_2$ denoted in the following as x:

$$Q_{\mathrm{s}}^2(x) = Q_0^2\left(\frac{x_0}{x}\right)^{\lambda} \tag{1}$$

where Q_0 is an arbitrary scale parameter for which we take 1 GeV/c, and for x_0 we take 10^{-3}.

An immediate consequence of (1) is GS of particle (or strictly speaking gluon) spectra [9]:

$$\frac{dN_{\mathrm{g}}}{dyd^2p_{\mathbf{T}}} = S_{\perp}\mathscr{F}(\tau) \tag{2}$$

where

$$\tau = \frac{p_{\mathbf{T}}^2}{Q_{\mathbf{s}}^2(x)} \tag{3}$$

is the scaling variable. Here $S_{\perp}$ is a transverse area which will be specified later. Logarithmic corrections due the running of the strong coupling constant are neglected in Eq. (2).

In order to integrate (2) over d^2p_{T} we have to change integration variable to $d\tau$ which gives

$$\frac{dN_{\mathrm{g}}}{dy} = A\,S_{\perp}\bar{Q}_{\mathrm{s}}^2(W) \tag{4}$$

where A is an energy independent integral of the universal function $\mathscr{F}(\tau)$ over $d\tau$. Here

$$\bar{Q}_{\mathrm{s}}(W) = Q_0\left(\frac{W}{Q_0}\right)^{\lambda/(2+\lambda)} \tag{5}$$

is an *average* saturation scale which gives (provided that $S_\perp$ is energy *independent*) power like growth of multiplicity with the scattering energy W – a fact well confirmed by recent LHC data on multiparticle production.

An immediate consequence of Eq. (4) is that [6]

$$\langle p_{\rm T}\rangle \sim \bar{Q}_{\rm s}(W)\,, \tag{6}$$

which means that $\langle p_{\rm T}\rangle$ rises with energy as $W^{\lambda/(2+\lambda)}$. In order to find numerical value of λ we have performed simple analysis [6] based on GS hypothesis, requiring that ratios

$$\mathscr{R}_{ik}(\tau) = \frac{dN(W_i,\tau)}{dyd^2p_{\rm T}} \Big/ \frac{dN(W_k,\tau)}{dyd^2p_{\rm T}} \tag{7}$$

are as close to unity as possible over the widest range of τ, with the result $\lambda \approx 0.22$. As a consequence mean $p_{\rm T}$ rises with energy as a power of energy W, which, as shown in Fig. 1, is in perfect agreement with high energy data [10].



FIGURE 1. Mean transverse momentum as a function of energy with the power-like fit $0.227 \times W^{0.099}$ (solid line). Compilation of data taken from Ref. [10]. The dashed line corresponds to the CMS logarithmic fit aimed at describing also low energy data: $0.413 - 0.0171\,\ln s + 0.00143\,\ln^2 s$, with $W^2 = s$. (Figure from Ref. [6].)

Replacing $\bar{Q}_{\rm s}(W)$ in Eq. (1) by (4) at fixed $W = W_0$ and adding a constant piece, which takes into account nonperturbative effects and contributions from the particle masses, we arrive at [5]:

$$\langle p_{\rm T}\rangle|_{W_0} = \alpha + \beta \sqrt{\frac{\pi N_{\rm ch}}{S_\perp(\sqrt[3]{\gamma N_{\rm ch}})|_{W_0}}}\,. \tag{8}$$

Here α and β are constants that do not depend on energy and γ is a parameter that, using parton-hadron duality assumption, relates number of gluons to the number of charged particles.

Three important comments concerning Eq. (8) are in order. First, transverse size entering Eqs. (2) and (4) in a situation where we fix number of particles corresponds to the overlap between two hadrons colliding at given impact parameter b. As such it does depend on the multiplicity itself. Second, in Eq. (8) we have assumed explicit relation between $S_\perp$ and $N_g = \gamma N_{\rm ch}$ that has been calculated in the CGC effective theory [11], which essentially says that particle multiplicity is proportional to the interaction *volume*. Explicitly: it rises with volume linearly up to some maximal $V_{\rm max}$ and then at fixed volume it rises further on only due to fluctuations. This allows to define interaction *radius* $R \sim S_\perp^{1/2}$ whose explicit dependence on N_g can be found in Refs. [5, 6]. And finally, the CGC calculations have been performed for fixed scattering energy W_0, so in principle in order to find mean $p_{\rm T}$ at a different energy one should recalculate $S_\perp$ in Eq. (8). In the following we shall argue that this is essentially not necessary.

Indeed, although after Eq. (5) we have argued that $S_\perp$ does not depend on energy, in a situation when we change energy at *fixed* multiplicity, we have to vary $S_\perp$ accordingly, so that Eq. (4) remains satisfied. As a result at higher

energies the same number of particles comes from the smaller overlap, *i.e.* from larger b. Taking into account this *induced* energy dependence of the interaction radius

$$R|_W = \left(\frac{W_0}{W}\right)^{\lambda/(2+\lambda)} R|_{W_0} \tag{9}$$

we arrive at

$$\langle p_{\rm T}\rangle|_W = \alpha + \beta\,\frac{\sqrt{N_{\rm ch}}}{R(\sqrt[3]{\gamma N_{\rm ch}})|_W} = \alpha + \beta\left(\frac{W}{W_0}\right)^{\lambda/(2+\lambda)} \frac{\sqrt{N_{\rm ch}}}{R(\sqrt[3]{\gamma N_{\rm ch}})|_{W_0}} \tag{10}$$

where W_0 corresponds to the energy for which the interaction radius has been computed in some explicit model. In the CGC theory that we use here [11] $W_0 = 7$ TeV for pp and 5.02 TeV for pPb.

It follows from Eq. (10) that there exists a universal scaling variable

$$(W/W_0)^{\lambda/(2+\lambda)}\,\sqrt{N_{\rm ch}}/\,R(\sqrt[3]{\gamma N_{\rm ch}})\Big|_{W_0}$$

for which all mean $p_{\rm T}$ data should fall on one curve. This scaling property is clearly visible in Fig. 2.



FIGURE 2. Mean $\langle p_{\rm T}\rangle$ in p-p collisions at 7 TeV (full black circles), 2.76 TeV (full red down-triangles), 0.9 TeV (full blue up-triangles) and in p-Pb collisions at 5.02 TeV (full brown diamonds) plotted in terms of scaling variable $(W/W_0)^{\lambda/(2+\lambda)}\sqrt{N_{\rm ch}/S_\perp}$. For p-p $W_0 = 7$ TeV and for p-Pb $W_0 = 5.02$ TeV. (Figure from Ref. [6].)

To obtain plots in Fig. 2 we have used parametrization of $R(\sqrt[3]{N_g})$ at $W_0 = 7$ TeV from Ref. [5]. It is however clear from Eq. (9) that for energies smaller than W_0, but still large, the interaction radius can become exceedingly large, especially for large multiplicities. We expect therefore that for large multiplicities interaction radii at different energies should tend to a common limiting value [6]. The details of this saturation can be extracted from the data. To this end we have used first equation in formula (10) to extract shape of $R(N_{\rm ch})$ (assuming $\beta = 1$). In order to fix the only remaining parameter α we have required scaling law (9) to be valid over the largest possible range of $N_{\rm ch}$ with the result $\alpha = 0.285$. The interaction radii for pp collisions at different energies obtained in this way are plotted in Fig. 3. We see that indeed they show a kind of turnover for large multiplicities – a sign of possible convergence to the scaling value at $N_{\rm ch} \to \infty$. This may be verified by future measurements of mean $p_{\rm T}$. Let us stress, however, that from this point of view, measurements of $\langle p_{\rm T}\rangle$ for very large $N_{\rm ch}$ at smaller energies would be even more interesting. On the same plot in Fig. 3 we also show the CGC calculation of $R(\sqrt[3]{\gamma N_{\rm ch}})/\beta$ with $\gamma = 1.138$ as extracted from the data in Ref. [6] (dashed line). We see quite good agreement with the model independent result at 7 TeV represented by (black) full circles.

The analysis presented here shows that an intriguing insight into the interaction geometry in multiple particle production can be gained by studying mean $p_{\rm T}$ correlation with $N_{\rm ch}$. A good description of recent ALICE data is obtained when one assumes that number of particles produced at given impact parameter is proportional to the overlap *volume* of the interacting hadrons rather than to the *transverse area* alone. This means that the evolution time in the longitudinal direction is larger for larger multiplicities. Similar mechanism has been proposed within the framework of the multipomeron exchange model [7] where one postulates that the string tension of the color system stretched after the collision gets larger for larger multiplicities. In our analysis based on saturation and geometrical scaling



FIGURE 3. Interaction radii for pp collisions at 0.9 TeV (blue) up-triangles, 2.76 TeV (red) down-triangles and 7 TeV (black) full circles extracted from the mean $p_{\rm T}$ data by means on the first equation of formula (10) with $\beta = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.285$ together with experimental errors. Dashed line corresponds to the CGC parameterization of Ref. [6].

fixed number of particles is produced from smaller volume when the collision energy increases. This means that when multiplicity is fixed collisions are more peripheral at high energy and more central at lower energies. However, since there is a natural cutoff on the size of the interaction volume corresponding to the size of interacting hadrons, one expects that for very large multiplicities interaction radii tend to the fixed limit independently of energy. This trend seems to be seen already in the existing LHC data. Future data will shed more light on this interesting issue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to the organizers of the International Workshop on Diffraction in High-Energy Physics 2014, Primošten, Croatia, for the stimulating and interesting meeting. The research of M.P. has been supported by the Polish NCN grant 2011/01/B/ST2/00492.

REFERENCES

1. B. B. Abelev *et al.* [ALICE Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2662 [arXiv:1307.1093 [nucl-ex]].
2. B. B. Abelev *et al.* [ALICE Collaboration], *Phys. Lett. B* **727** (2013) 371 [arXiv:1307.1094 [nucl-ex]].
3. G. Gustafson, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **39** (2008) 2173.
4. T. Pierog, I. Karpenko, J. M. Katzy, E. Yatsenko and K. Werner, arXiv:1306.0121 [hep-ph].
5. L. McLerran, M. Praszalowicz and B. Schenke, *Nucl. Phys. A* **916** (2013) 210 [arXiv:1306.2350 [hep-ph]].
6. L. McLerran and M. Praszalowicz, arXiv:1407.6687 [hep-ph].
7. N. Armesto, D. A. Derkach and G. A. Feofilov, *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **71** (2008) 2087.
8. L. Van Hove, *Phys. Lett. B* **118** (1982) 138.
9. L. McLerran and M. Praszalowicz, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **41** (2010) 1917 [arXiv:1006.4293 [hep-ph]] and *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **42** (2011) 99 [arXiv:1011.3403 [hep-ph]].
10. V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 022002 [arXiv:1005.3299 [hep-ex]].
11. A. Bzdak, B. Schenke, P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. C* **87** (2013) 6, 064906 [arXiv:1304.3403 [nucl-th]].